

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 40 and 56 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the specification and claims as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-39, 42-46, 51-53 and 61-63 were previously canceled.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 40-41, 47-50 and 54-60 will be pending in the present application, with claims 40 and 56 being independent.

1. Claim Objections

Claims 40 and 56 are objected to because of the following informalities: claims 40 and 56 recite the limitation “the carousel image” in part (j). The Office Action states that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Claims 40 and 56 have been amended to overcome the claim objections. For at least this reason, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 40 and 56 are respectfully requested.

2. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejects claims 40-41, 47, 50, 54-57 and 60 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bisdikian et al. (US 6,047,317). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Bisdikian et al. discloses a video presentation system that receives a plurality of series of digital data segments, or image frames, that are cyclically transmitted (see abstract). Each series of image frames is referred to as a “carousel” (see col. 3, lines 43-44). Bisdikian et al. discloses a carousel 1, which comprises a directory 24, root image frame 26 and a plurality of succeeding image frames 28, that is repetitively transmitted by a transmitter 16 of a head end 10 to a receiver

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 09/895,452
Attorney Docket Number: 92819.02
Filing Date: June 29, 2001

facility 12 (see col. 3, lines 45-49; Figure 2). Therefore, Bisdikian et al. discloses a carousel having image frames and repetitively transmitting the carousel from a head end to a receiver, but is silent about constructing a carousel of pages by adding a new page to an already existing carousel at a head end. Consequently, Bisdikian et al. fails to disclose or suggest the elements of constructing a carousel of pages for transmission to subscriber receivers comprising providing a new page of content to an existing carousel of pages at the source of audiovideo data, as included, in some form, in independent claims 40 and 56.

The Office Action on page 3 asserts that Bisdikian et al. teaches that each subsequent page transmitted in a carousel is a new page received by the receiver. Additionally, the Office Action asserts that content on pages are updated at some point, and that the same content is not transmitted forever. However, even assuming for argument's sake that these assertions are correct, Bisdikian et al. still fails to disclose or suggest the feature of providing a new page of content to an existing carousel of pages at the source of audiovideo data (e.g., at a head end), let alone constructing a carousel of pages comprising this feature.

Furthermore, the Office Action on pages 4-5 asserts that Bisdikian et al. discloses determining which pages in the carousel contain links to the new page; modifying metadata for each page in the carousel containing links to the new page; determining which pages in the carousel are linked to by the new page; and modifying metadata for the new page for each page in the carousel linked to by the new page (citing col. 6, lines 1-7 and 45-55). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Bisdikian et al. discloses that each image frame of a carousel comprises a first data portion from which an image 32 can be constructed and displayed, and a second portion comprising a navigation data table 34 (see col. 4, lines 6-10; Figure 3). Each image 32 may be provided with hot spots, which may cause a sub-procedure to be activated to change the displayed image. To accomplish this function, the navigation data table 34 includes entries for a number of hot spots in the displayed image, location of each hot spot, rectangle corners for each

hot spot, and hyperlink data to any other data/video/audio sources associated with a hot spot (see col. 4, lines 11-25; col. 6, lines 1-4 and 47-50).

In asserting that Bisdikian et al. discloses the elements of determining which pages in the carousel contain links to the new page and modifying metadata for each page in the carousel containing links to the new page, the Office Action on pages 3-4 asserts “if www.cnn.com/weather is the new page, all other pages containing links to that page will be updated” and “the navigation data table updates new pages so that it could respond when a hot spot is selected by the user”. It is unclear to applicants how the sections cited in Bisdikian et al. teach that if www.cnn.com/weather is the new page, all other pages containing links to that page would be updated. Additionally, it is unclear to applicants how the sections cited in Bisdikian et al. teach that the navigation data table updates new pages so that it can respond when a hot spot is selected by the user. As discussed above, at most, Bisdikian et al. discloses an image frame comprising a navigation data table that includes entries relating to hotspots. However, Bisdikian et al. fails to teach or suggest that the navigation data table, or any other component, is used to determine which pages in the carousel contain links to the new page, and to modify metadata for each page in the carousel containing links to the new page, as included, in some form, in independent claims 40 and 56. Similarly, Bisdikian et al. fails to teach or suggest that the navigation data table, or any other component, is used to determine which pages in the carousel are linked to by the new page, and to modify metadata for the new page for each page in the carousel linked to by the new page, as included, in some form, in independent claims 40 and 56.

Therefore, since Bisdikian et al. fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 40 and 56, these claims are allowable.

Claims 41, 47, 50 and 54-55 depend from claim 40. Claims 57 and 60 depend from claim 56. As discussed above, claims 40 and 56 are allowable. For at least this reason, and the additional features recited therein, claims 41, 47, 50, 54-55, 57 and 60 are also allowable.

For at least the reasons above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 09/895,452
Attorney Docket Number: 92819.02
Filing Date: June 29, 2001

40-41, 47, 50, 54-57, and 60 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) are respectfully requested.

3. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 48-49 and 58-59 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bisdikian et al. in view of Tanigawa et al. (US 5,973,681). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, Bisdikian et al. fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 40 and 56. Tanigawa et al. fails to cure this defect in Bisdikian et al.

Tanigawa et al. is directed towards a transmitting apparatus for an interactive communication system wherein two distinct storage units are utilized, where the second unit stores control information showing links between the frames of image data stored on the first storage unit and where the transmitting unit repeatedly transmits a predetermined number of frames of image data (see abstract). However, Tanigawa et al. fails to disclose or suggest the elements of constructing a carousel of pages for transmission to subscriber receivers comprising providing a new page of content to an existing carousel of pages at the source of audiovideo data; determining which pages in the carousel contain links to the new page; modifying metadata for each page in the carousel containing links to the new page; determining which pages in the carousel are linked to by the new page; and modifying metadata for the new page for each page in the carousel linked to by the new page, as included, in some form, in independent claims 40 and 56.

Therefore, since Bisdikian et al. and Tanigawa et al., alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 40 and 56, these claims are allowable.

Claims 48-49 depend from claim 40. Claims 58-59 depend from claim 56. As discussed above, claims 40 and 56 are allowable. For at least this reason, and the additional features recited therein, claims 48-49 and 58-59 are also allowable.

For at least the reasons above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 09/895,452
Attorney Docket Number: 92819.02
Filing Date: June 29, 2001

48-49 and 58-59 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

4. Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the present application is requested. Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 09/895,452
Attorney Docket Number: 92819.02
Filing Date: June 29, 2001

PATENT

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: June 1, 2007

By: /Sung T. Kim/

Sung T. Kim, Reg. No.: 45,398
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone: (703) 647-6574
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

June 1, 2007
Date

/Kate Marochkina/
Signature

Kate Marochkina
Type or Print Name

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 09/895,452
Attorney Docket Number: 92819.02
Filing Date: June 29, 2001